



OK to Enter
PTA 8/2/05

Attorney's Docket No. 018976-199

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)
Masatoshi Arishiro et al.) Group Art Unit: 1733
Application No.: 09/893,399) Examiner: JOHN T HARAN
Filed: June 29, 2001) Confirmation No. 6008
For: MANUFACTURING APPARATUS) Appeal No.:
FOR MANUFACTURING)
ELECTRONIC MONOLITHIC)
CERAMIC COMPONENTS)

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF – PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: February 16, 2005

Sir:

In accordance with 37 C.R.F. §41.41, Applicants submit a Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed December 16, 2004.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's statement that they failed to address the obviousness of the combined teachings of the references in view of the art of the whole and what would be common knowledge and common sense to one of ordinary skill in the art. (Examiner's Answer page 11). Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner, as stated in the MPEP § 2143.01, "The mere fact references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). As stated in In re Lee, 61 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1430 (CAFC 2002), "the search for and analysis of the prior art includes evidence relevant to the findings of whether there is teaching, motivation or suggestion to select and combine the references relied on as evidence of obviousness." Additionally, as stated in the MPEP §2143.01 "a statement that modification of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been "well within the ordinary skill of the art at the time the claimed invention was made" because the references relied upon teach that all aspects of the claimed invention